

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,693	10/27/2000	Jose Gabriel Menchero	VTEK-110	5993
27872	7590 12/20/2004		EXAMINER	
	EQUITZ LLP GOMERY STREET, SUITE	NGUYEN, NGA B		
	ISCO, CA 94104	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3628	· · · · · ·
			DATE MAILED: 12/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/698,693	MENCHERO, JOSE GABRIE
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Nga B. Nguyen	3628
	The MAILING DATE of this communicat		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) data period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION.  ' CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reation.  ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. 8 133)
Status			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b). Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the closed in accordance with the practice under the closed in accordance with the closed in accordance with the practice under the closed in t	This action is non-final.     allowance except for formal matter	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 5,6,10-13 and 16-19 is/are penda) Of the above claim(s) is/are we Claim(s) 6,12,13,18 and 19 is/are allowed Claim(s) 5,10,11,16 and 17 is/are reject Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration. ed. ed.	
Applicati	on Papers		
· 10)	The specification is objected to by the ExThe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[ Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to to to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for factorial All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International see the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in Ap ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO r No(s)/Mail Date	948) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 

Application/Control Number: 09/698,693 Page 2

Art Unit: 3628

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is the answer to the Amendment filed on September 21, 2004, which paper has been placed of record in the file.

2. Claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19 are pending in this application.

## Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5, 6, 10-13, and 16-19 have been considered but are most in view of new grounds of rejection.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggioncalda et al (hereinafter Maggioncalda), U.S. Patent No. 5,918,217.

Regarding to claims 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17, Maggioncalda discloses a computer system, comprising:

a processor programmed to perform an arithmetic performance attribution

Art Unit: 3628

computation to determine portfolio performance (figure 2, processor 202; column 6, lines 25-42);

a display device coupled to the processor arithmetic performance attribution computation for displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation (figure 1, display 221; column 6, lines 45-55).

Note that the claimed invention recites an intended use, although Maggioncalda fails to discuss the intended use which is to perform an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, including by determining coefficients of a specifically recited type, and determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way using these coefficients, Maggioncalda's computer system is capable of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggioncalda's to include the feature above for the purpose of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation.

"The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable." *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Application/Control Number: 09/698,693 Page 4

Art Unit: 3628

## Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 6, 12, 13, 18, and 19 are allowed because the prior arts cited of record do not disclose the claimed invention.

#### Conclusion

7. Claims 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are rejected.

Claims 6, 12, 13, 18, and 19 are allowed

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on (703) 308-0505.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-1113.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

C/o Technology Center 3600

Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9326 (for formal communication intended for entry),

Application/Control Number: 09/698,693

Art Unit: 3628

or

(703) 308-3691 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Page 5

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Nga B. Nguyen

December 10, 2004